

WASTEFUL MANAGERIAL PRACTICES AND ITS EFFECT ON EMPLOYEE ATTITUDE TO THEIR ORGANIZATION

Dr. Assegid Demissie Shishigu
 Department of Management, University of Gondar
Ethiopia
 Email: Assegid04@gmail.com

Abstract: *The purpose of this study was to assess the extent of wasteful managerial practices and employees attitude to their organization and the relationship between the two managerial issues. Data was collected from a sample of 210 employees selected randomly. Two adapted research instruments used. The main findings of this study showed that wasteful managerial practices and employees' negative attitude to their organization are found rampant and critical problems in organization under study. The findings also revealed that wasteful managerial practices and employees' attitude to their organization have insignificant and negative association. Most male and respondents having more than 6 years of work experiences have perceived the manifestation of wasteful managerial practices. The result of this study also indicated that except female, employees having 5 and below years of services, and administrative staffs the remaining category of respondents have negative attitude to their college. Wasteful managerial practices have also insignificant effect or influence on employees' attitude to their organization.*

Keywords: *Waste, Wasteful, Practices, Attitude*

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizations have good and bad managerial practices. Some leaders may not give due attentions to their unproductive or wasteful managerial practices. According to Gupta, C.B. (1992), these *wasteful Management Practices are activities unintentionally performed and do not contribute to the achievement of organizations' objectives* (Unproductive organizational practices are occurring gradually and silently. Most managers fall short to recognize and manage them (ibid).

In order to accomplish their organizational objectives organizational leaders has to avoid counterproductive activities and employees shall have positive attitude to their organization (www.hr-survey.com/EmployeeAttitude.htm).

However, currently, the rampant of *Wasteful Managerial Practices and Employee negative Attitude to their Organization* in work places become crucial management problems. There are many studies conducted on each individual dimension of wasteful managerial practices separately. However, there are few or none studies that have been conducted to assess the extent of Wasteful Management Practices and its effect on employees' attitude to their organization.

Therefore, this study tried to assess the problems. That is, the manifestation of *wasteful managerial practices* as perceived by teaching and supporting staffs and the extent of their own *attitude to their College*. The study also tries to find out the association with the two crucial organizational issues.

1.1.Objective of the study

To address the above mentioned managerial issues the following objectives were proposed:

- 1.To assess the extent of Wasteful Managerial Practices (in terms of *Hypocrisy, Procrastination, Organizational Politics, Confusing Message, Unproductive Meetings*) in the College;
- 2.To Identify teaching and supporting staffs attitude to their organization; and
- 3.To assess the relationship of Wasteful Management practices with employees' attitude to their organization

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Wasteful Management Practices

“Waste” is any accomplishment that adds cost, but does not add worth as perceived by users (Ohno, 1988; Womack and Jones, 1996). Denis Donovan, (nd) also define *Waste* as a means to expend uselessly; to squander; to neglect. The word “*Practice*” to connote performance or execution; custom or habit. Therefore, “*Wasteful practices*” to connote habitually to squander or neglect. In organization, wasteful activities occur so frequently and are become “habit” of the organization (Denis Donovan, (nd)). In this study, *wasteful management practices* mean a collection of unproductive small activities, that does not contribute to the achievement of organization’s goals and not recognized and controlled by the leaders.

In this study, Wasteful Management Practices (WMPs) is treated in terms of five elements, (that is, *Procrastination, hypocrisy, organizational politics, confusing message and unproductive meetings*). These dimensions of Wasteful Management Practices are common and unproductive or wasteful activities that have crept into an organization and come part of organization’s normal operations. These counterproductive practices existed on they are permitted to exist and little has been done to avoid them (Gupta C.B., 1992).

These dimensions of Wasteful Management Practices in work places are addressed briefly discussed below:

Hypocrisy: The term hypocrisy is a derivative from the Greek word “hypokrisis” meaning ‘*act of playing a part on the stage*’. A hypocrite is someone that acts like an actor with deception. Hypocrisy is a false appearance of virtue or goodness, with dissimulation of real character or inclination (the Oxford English Dictionary, 2ND Ed). It is the practice of pretending to be dissimilar to what one really is (Hornby, 1995); or the disagreement between what officials believe other people should do and what they actually would do themselves in such a circumstances (Batson & Thompson, 2001).

Hypocrisy may happen anytime, anywhere, any situation, and are done by anyone, (Festinger, L. 1957). Many people unconsciously are hypocritical in their life. They do such tasks which are unsuitable for their own principles. We are all hypocrites. At some point in our lives, we acted in a way that is inconsistent with our attitudes (ibid).

A hypocrite is usually someone whose saying is not in line with his/her action. Hypocrites are people that publicly uphold strict moral norms; expecting and demanding others to follow them, but who privately violate these espoused standards in their own behavior (Valdesolo, P., & DeSteno, D. 2007; Sipos, 2009). a hypocrite is one that “falsely professes to be virtuously or religiously inclined; one who pretends to have feelings or beliefs of a higher order than his real ones; hence generally, a dissembler, pretender.” (The Oxford English Dictionary, 2ND Ed).

Procrastination: The word “Procrastination” is originated from Latin word “*pro*”, meaning “forward, forth, or in favor of”. “*crastinus*”, meaning “of tomorrow”, (Klein, 1971). According to the Oxford English Reference Dictionary, (1996), Procrastination is deferring action, in particular without good reason. It is a means of self-handicapping (Burka & Yuen, 2008); unreasonable delay of behavior (Akerlof, 1991; Burka & Yuen, 1983).

Procrastination is putting off tasks that should be focusing on right now. It is a delaying desire to make a decision or accomplishing a task that increases unnecessary pressure (Prohaska, Morrill, Atilas, & Perez, 2000). Procrastination could be also a voluntarily delay an intended task despite expecting to be worse-off for the delay, (Steel 2007). The fear of failure often leads to procrastination in order to avoid feeling that one did not to meet the standards required of him (Burka & Yuen, 2008).

Procrastination can be also connoted in a number of ways depending on which the behavior is being emphasized: as delay in conjunction with subjective discomfort, (Klingsieck, 2013; Solomon & Rothblum, 1984); postponement, (Beswick & Mann, 1994); and irrationality or as

illogical delay of behavior, (Sabini & Silver, 1982); the **irrational** delay of behavior (Akerlof, 1991; Burka & Yuen, 1983; Ellis & Knaus, 1977; Silver & Sabini, 1981).

According to Samuel Johnson (1751), procrastination is one of the weaknesses, which, in spite of the teaching of moralists, and the remonstrance's of reason, succeed in a greater or less degree in every mind. Even The Bhagavad Gita, influential spiritual text of Hinduism, written in approximately 500 BC. Within it, Krishna maintains, "Undisciplined, vulgar, stubborn, wicked, malicious, lazy, depressed, and *procrastinating*; such an agent is called a Taamasika agent" 18.28, (Gandhi, Strohmeier, & Nagler, 2000).

approximately 15% - 20% of the adult population (Harriott & Ferrari, 1996) and 50% of students perceive themselves as engaging in procrastination to the extent that it causes personal distress or difficulties, (Day, Mensink, & O'Sullivan, 2000).

Organizational politics: Organizational politics is the existence of personal multiple interests and incompatible goals, further than the goals of organization, and the influence methods used to defend them (Sami Ullah, & Abu, 2011; Ferris, & Fandt, 1989). It is an illegal advancement for attaining power through various ways of merit, or used to achieve power, either by hook or by crook for getting promotion, or obtaining huge money or benefits (Dubrin, 2001). Organizational politics is individual action directed to furthering his personal self-interest without regarding the benefits of others or the organization (Kacmar and Baron, 1999). It is a silent political practices that can be done, to achieve the desired goals at the expense of other employees or organizational goals as well, (Kacmar and Andrews ,2001; Judge & Bretz, 1994). Organizational politics is frequently associated with manipulation, and unlawful ways of overusing power to attain personal objectives (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992). It is an influence tactic of managers by attacking or blaming others, use of information, impression management, and support building for ideas, ingratiation, coalitions, and association with influential and creating obligations (Allen et al., 1979).

It operates based on unwritten rules of success that send delicate, vague and anxiety messages to employees about politically "correct" behaviors such as whom to appraise ,whom to fear, whom to keep away from, whom to hold responsible (Barton, et al., 1999). Organizational politics has a negative influence on both workers and the work environment (e.g., Ferris, Adams, Kolodinsky, Hochwarter, & Ammeter, 2002; Kacmar & Baron, 1999).

According to Mintzberg (1983), organizational politics is individual or group behavior that is informal. Technically, it is unlawful sanction by formal authority. If employees perceived as there is high levels of organizational politics and they had little control over these organizational activities, organizational politics will be perceived as a **risk** Ferris et al., (1989).

Confusing Message: One of the most counterproductive activity of leaders in organizations is distributing information selectively and do not make their expectations known .The absence of adequate communication creates frustration among workers,(Barton,et al., (1999).The problem with these confusing messages is that workers take everything is a priority, when nothing is a main concern. Employees are wasting large amount of their energy and time working on the wrong tasks and accomplishing the wrong results. They become extremely frustrated in the processes and de-motivated (Barton,et al., (1999).

Unproductive meeting: Meetings are important to the achievement of organizations. Meetings provide a controlling factor of achieving the organizational objectives. But in reality, managers attend too many meetings weekly, which sometimes become a reason for resentment in the part of the managers and employees, (Hackman &Johensin, 2004).Organizational leaders attend and conduct meetings that do not directly contribute to the fulfillment the organizational objectives. According to Hackman &Johensin, (2004), unproductive meetings do not just happen, even they are not a curse thrown upon all who have the courage to work together in groups. The root cause of boring, bad meetings is that those responsible for calling a meeting and then fails to plan how

the group's time will be used.

Unproductive meeting is calling a meeting without assessing the need for conducting the meeting; call the same individuals to every meeting, regardless of the topics on the agenda; preparing a disorganized list of topics and calling it an agenda; and Fail to share the agenda with participant in advance of the meeting. <http://blog.lucidmeetings.com/blog/>

Bad meetings are also one that is short of an agenda, rat hole on inappropriate topics, end without decisions and serve as platforms for managers that fail to follow up with action objects (CBS Interactive Inc., 2012).

There are statistics and help focusing attention on wasteful and unproductive meetings.

According to Get a Klu, a consulting, professionals lose 31 hours per month to unproductive meetings. Klu also suggests that of the 11 million meetings that occur to the U.S. every day, half the meeting time is unproductive (CBS Interactive Inc., 2012). 73 percent of professionals admit to doing not related work in meetings and 39 percent even dozed off in meetings (CBS Interactive Inc., 2012).

2.2 Employee Attitude to their organization

According to Robbins (2003) cited in Alok Kumar Srivastav , Priyanka Das, (2013:103) attitudes indicate a person's inclination to think or behave in a positive or negative manner to the entity.

"Attitude is a mental state of readiness organized through experience, exerting a directive or active influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related" (ibid: 103). Attitude explains a person's favorable or unfavorable assessment of the behavior in question (Ajzen, 1985). It may be interpreted as a personality dimension coming to the forefront in the individual's behavior to others or situations (Anghelache et al., 2011).

2.3 Employee Attitude to Their Organization and Leaders' Wasteful Managerial Practices

The idea of attitude has implication for leaders. Attitudes describe one's predispositions to give aspects of the world. It gives emotional basis of individual's interpersonal relations and identification with others. Attitudes are closed to the core of personality, (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975 cited in Alok Kumar Srivastav 1, Priyanka Das, 2013:103).

Employees inspect the senior leadership actions and the basic value propositions of their organizations, (Woodall, 2003). Mitchell, (2000) indicated that a number of factors account for differences in the attitudes and behavior of workers. In their study, educational level and age were identified as important determinants of attitude (Ibid). Managerial activities influence employees' attitudes and behaviors such as developing confidence in themselves and having increased work engagement through working together (Kahn, 1990; Chen & Francesco, 2000; Miroshnik, 2002; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Gardner & Schermerhorn Jr. 2004). A social exchange relationship between a leader and employees affects the employees' attitudes to their organization. Leaders' supports and concerns further than the criteria formally required can lead employees to have positive attitudes to the organization (Blau, 1964).

However, But there are few or no research is available that assess or explore employees attitude to their organization and its associations with organizational leaders wasteful managerial practices.

3. METHODOLOGY

For this study 301 questionnaires were disrupted but 210 workable questionnaires were collected and the analysis of this study was done based on the data obtained from these samples.

Two research instruments were adapted to use in this study. To measure *Wasteful managerial practices an instrument was adapted from* (Parkinson, C.N., 1957; Gupta, C.B. 1992; Barton, et al, 1999, and Hackman & Johensin, 2004). This instrument has 24 questions on 5 dimensions (that is, organizational politics=4 ;Confusing message=6;unproductive meeting =4; Hypocrisy=4; and procrastination=6). To check the reliability of the instrument, Cronbach's Alpha (.883) is

used. The validity of the instrument is checked by Factor analysis, result is 80% for 7 components.

The **second** research tool used to measure employees attitude to their organization is adapted from Anandakumar Mills (www.sukumarmphil.webs.com).

This research instrument has 4 items and its reliability was checked by means of Cronbach's Alpha and Inter-item correlation. The Cronbach's Alpha test result was found to be .874, and the inter item correlation was between ($r=.416$ to $r=.773$) at significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Factor Analysis is also used to test the validity of the instrument. The test result is found to be 73% for 1 component.

For both instruments Participants were asked to express their perception of the practices of the wasteful managerial activities and they express their agreement /disagreement along a five-point Likert response scale, ($1 = \text{strongly agree}$, $2 = \text{Disagree}$, $3 = \text{Neutral}$, $4 = \text{Agree}$ and $5 = \text{strongly disagree}$).

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Extents of Wasteful Management Practices and Employees' Attitude to Their Organization

Table 1 below revealed the descriptive statistics of the existence of **Wasteful Managerial Practices** was perceived by 122(58%) of respondents. Among the dimensions of Wasteful Managerial Practices, **procrastination** by 172 (82%) and **Unproductive Meetings** by 157(75%) of the respondents relatively have higher perception of the problems. From these data we can understand that relatively the majority of the respondents agreed about the existence of Wasteful Management Practices in their organization.

The Table 1 also showed that 118 (56%) of respondents had negative attitude to their organization. The result of the study indicated that according to most of the teaching and supporting staffs of the college, counterproductive managerial activities in their organizations rampant and employees have a negative attitude onto their college.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of wasteful managerial practice and employees' attitude to their organization

		Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
		F	percent	F	percent	F	percent
Wasteful Managerial Practices		122	58	43	21	49	23
	Organizational politics	101	48	35	17	63	30
	Confusing messages	97	46	46	22	67	32
	Unproductive Meetings	157	75	33	16	20	10
	Hypocrisy	85	41	62	30	67	32

	Procrastination	172	82	39	19	28	13
Employees' Attitude to Their Organization	118	56	64	31	28	13	

4.2 The relationship between Wasteful Managerial Practices and the Attitude of Employees to Their Organization

As shown in Table 2, *Wasteful Managerial Practices* has negative and statistically insignificant relationship to employees attitude to their organization ($r=-.038$). The table also revealed the associations with employees' attitude to their organization and individual dimensions of *Wasteful Managerial Practices*. The result was for organizational politics ($r= -.052$), *Confusing messages* ($r=-.149$), and *Hypocrisy* ($r=-.115$). However, two of the dimensions of *wasteful Managerial practices*, namely, *Unproductive Meetings* and *Procrastination* had positive, but insignificant relationship, $r=.079$ and $r=.10$, respectively.

Table 2: Correlations between wasteful managerial Practices and employees attitude to their organization

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Wasteful managerial Practices	1					
Organizational politics	.730**					
Confusing messages	.790**	.713**				
Unproductive Meetings	.875**	.608**	.590**			
Hypocrisy	.681**	.271*	.318**	.641**		
Procrastination	.668**	.198	.285*	.505**	.409**	
Employees attitude	-.038	-.052	-.149	.079	-.115	.100

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

4.3 The effect of Wasteful Managerial Practices and the Attitude of Employees to Their Organization

Results of the Regression Analysis in Table 3 also revealed ($R^2 = .001$) and (adjusted $R^2 = -.013$). This means, -1.3 percent variances in the current level of *Employees' Attitude to Their Organization* is accounted for the manifestation of *Wasteful Managerial Practices*. Therefore, wasteful managerial practices are rampant in the college but it effects on employees negative attitude to their organization requires further study.

Table 3: Result of regression analysis

Model	R	R. Square	Adjusted R. Square	Sin.
1	.038a	.0001	-0.013	000

a. Predictors: (Constant), **Wasteful Managerial Practices**

4.4 Perception of Wasteful Managerial practice as per their backgrounds

Table 4 shows male respondents 88 (50%) confirmed the prevalence of wasteful managerial practices, however, female participants 27(60%) did not perceive the existence of wasteful Management practices in their college.

The table also revealed 46-67 % of respondents that have work experience 6 and more years admitted the rampant of wasteful managerial practices, while those who are serving less than 5

years did not agree on the existence of the problem. On the other hand, the teaching staffs 32 (44%) and of administrative staffs 19 (50%) also perceived the prevalence of wasteful managerial practices.

The data implies that only most of the female workers and those who have less service year were not able to recognize the prevalence of the unproductive managerial practices. But, all male respondents and those participants having 6 years and more work experiences were perceived the manifestation of wasteful managerial practices.

Table 4: Perception of Wasteful Managerial practice as per their backgrounds (N=210)

		Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
		F	percent	F	percent	F	percent
Sex	Female	11	24	7	16	27	60
	Male	88	50	23	13	64	37
Work experience	Below 5 years	11	21	12	22	30	57
	6-10 years	18	67	3	11	6	22
	11-15 years	9	53	5	29	3	18
	Above 16 years	6	46	2	15	5	39
Type of staff	Teaching	32	44	16	22	24	33
	Administrative	19	50	5	13	14	37

4.5 Level of Followers' attitude to their organization as per their Demographic variables

The data onto this Table 5 indicates that female respondents 31 (69%), employees having 5 and below years of work service 31 (59%), and administrative staffs 28 (74%) have confirmed as they have positive attitude to their organization. However, male respondents 94 (54%), teaching staffs 39 (54%), as well as most respondents served for more than 6 years have developed negative attitude to their organization.

Table 5: followers' attitude to their organization (N=210)

		Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
		F	percent	F	percent	F	Percent
Sex	Female	31	69	4	9	10	22
	Male	49	28	32	18	94	54
Work experience	Below 5 years	31	59	10	19	12	22
	6-10 years	7	26	2	7	18	67
	11-15 years	7	41	3	18	17	41
	Above 16 years	4	31	2	15	7	54
Staff	Teaching	23	32	10	14	39	54
	Administrative	28	74	1	3	9	24

5. CONCLUSION

Counter-productive or wasteful activities, such as, procrastinating, conducting unproductive meetings, exercising organizational politics, hypocrisy and confusing message are organizational problems perceived by most of the study group. Most female workers and those who have fewer service years were not able to recognize the prevalence of the unproductive managerial practices.

But all male and those having 6 and above years of work experiences have perceived the manifestation of wasteful managerial practices. The result of this study also indicated that most of the respondents have negative attitude to their organization. However, female, employees having 5 and below years of services, and most administrative staffs confirmed as they have positive attitude to their organization. Meanwhile male, teaching staffs, as well as most of respondents have served for more than 6 years have negative attitude to their college. The findings of this study also showed that wasteful managerial practices and employees' attitude to their organization have negative relationships. That is, the more rampant or exercise of wasteful managerial actives, the more employees develop negative attitude to their organization.

REFERENCES

- Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 252-276
- Alok Kumar Srivastav, Priyanka Das, (2013). Study on Employees Attitude To The Organization and Job Satisfaction, *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, ISSN (Online): 2319 7064
- Akerlof, G. A. (1991). Procrastination and Obedience. *American Economic Review*, 81, 2: 1–19.
- Arvey, R. D., Rotundo, M., Johnson, W., & McGue, M. (2003). The determinants of leadership: The role of genetics and personality .Paper presented at the 18th Annual Conference of the Society for *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Orlando, FL.
- Anandakumar Mills, A study on employee attitude, A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford, CA: Row, Peterson and Company. www.sukumarmphil.webs.com retrieved on 15/02/2016
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and Power*, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Beckmann (Eds.), *Volition and Personality: Action versus State Orientation* (pp. 391-396). Gottingen: Hogrefe & Hube
- Bernstein, P. (1998). *Against the gods: The remarkable story of risk*. New York: Wiley
- Beswick, G., & Mann, L. (1994). *State Orientation and Procrastination*. In J. Kuhl & J. Brief, A. (1998). *Attitudes in and around organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Burka, J. B., & Yuen, L. M. (1983). *Procrastination: Why you do it, what to do about it*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Burka, J. B., & Yuen, L. M. (2008). *Procrastination: Why you do it, what to do about it now*. Cambridge: De Capo Press
- Chissom, B., & Iran-Nejad, A. (1992). Development of an instrument to assess learning strategies. *Psychological Reports*, 71 :1001–1002.
- Chen, Z.X., and Francesco, A.M. (2000). Employee Journal of Social Psychology Demography, Organizational Commitment, and turn over intentions in China: do cultural differences matter?, *Human Relations*, 3,6 :869-87
- Chu, A. H. C., & Choi, J. N. (2005). Rethinking procrastination: Positive effects of “active” procrastination behavior on attitudes and performance 14:245–264
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 611–628.
- Eby et al., (2000). Cited in *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, November 2012, Vol. 2, No. 11
- Elliot (2002) Elliot, R. (2002). *A ten-year study of procrastination stability*, University of Louisiana, Monroe
- Ferrari, J. R. (1993b). *Procrastination and impulsiveness: Two sides of a coin?* In W. G. Festinger, L. & Carlsmith, J. M. (1959). Cognitive consequences of forced compliance. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 58: 203-210.

- Gandhi, M. K., Strohmeier, J., & Nagler, M. N. (2000). *The Bhagavad Gita, according to Gandhi*. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Hills Books
- Gardner, W. L. & Schermerhorn Jr, J. R. (2004). Performance gains through positive organizational behavior and authentic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33,3:270–281.
- Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J., & Rapson, R. (1994). *Emotional contagion*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hickman, E. (1998). *The works of Jonathan Edwards* (Vols. 1–2). Bath, England: Bath Press
- Hornby, A.S. (Ed). (1995). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, Great Britain: Oxford University Press.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33,4 :692–724
- Klein, E. (1971). *A comprehensive etymological dictionary of the English language*. New York: Elsevier
- Klingsieck, K. B. (2013). Procrastination: When Good Things Don't Come to Those Who Wait. *European Psychologist*, 18:24-34.
- Lindsley, D. H., Brass, D. J., & Thomas, J. B. (1995). Efficacy-performance spirals: A multilevel perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20: 645– 678.
- Mehrabian, A. (2000). Beyond IQ: Broad-based measurement of individual success potential or “emotional intelligence.” *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 126:133–239
- Milgram, N. A. (1992). Procrastination: A malady of modern time]. *Boletin de Psi-cologia*, 35:83–102.
- Miroshnik, V. (2002). Culture and International management: a Review. *Journal of Management Development*, 21,7:521-44
- Mitchell, S. (2000). *American Generations-Who They Are. How They Live. What they Think* 3rd Ed., N.Y.: New Strategic Publications, Inc
- Ohno, T. (1988). *Toyota Production System*, Productivity Press, Portland, OR.
- Womack, J. and Jones, D. (1996), *Lean Thinking*, Simon & Schuster, New York, NY
- Prohaska, V., Morrill, P., Atilas, I., & Perez, A. (2000). Academic procrastination by non traditional students. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 15,5:125-134.
- Robbins, (2003.) defined attitudes as evaluative statements and they can be either favorable or unfavorable concerning objects, people, or events. cited in Alok Kumar Srivastav 1, Priyanka Das, 2013:103
- Sabini, J., & Silver, M. (1982). *Moralities of Everyday Life*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Schneider, B., Gunnarson, S. K., & Niles-Jolly, K. (1994). Creating the climate and culture of success. *Organizational Dynamics*, 23:17-29.
- Steel, P. (2007). The Nature of Procrastination: A Meta-Analytic and Theoretical Review of Quintessential Self-Regulatory Failure. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133:65-94
- Sipos, M. Thomas. (2009). The False and Lazy Charge of Hypocrisy. www.comunistvampires.com/articles/hypocrisy.htm retrieved on October, 30th 2016
- Sirois, F. M. (2004b). Procrastination and intentions to perform health behaviours: The role of self efficacy and the consideration of future consequences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37:115–128.
- Tice, D. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (1997). Longitudinal study of procrastination, performance, stress, and health: The costs and benefits of dawdling. *Psychological Science*, 8:454 – 458.
- Westwood, R., and Posner, B. (1997). Managerial Values across Cultures: Australia, Hong Kong and the United States. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 14: 31-66
- Woodall, K. (2003). Survival: Can branding save your organization? *Communication World*, 20,1:11-13.

<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/how-much-do-useless-meetings-cost/>

<http://www.hr-survey.com/EmployeeAttitude.htm>

<http://blog.lucidmeetings.com/blog/the-root-cause-of-boring-unproductive-meetings>